



Attorney Docket No.: 42390.P18166

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor application of:

Grover, et al.

Application No: 10/750,040

Filed: December 30, 2003

For: METHOD AND SYSTEM TO
ADJUST NON-VOLATILITY
CACHE ASSOCIATIVITY

Examiner: Zhou H. Li

Art Unit: 2185

Assistant Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance

Sir:

In response to the Statement of Reasons for Allowance in the Notice of Allowance mailed June 02, 2006, please consider the following.

MPEP 1302.14 Reasons for Allowance sets forth that:

In most cases, the examiner's actions and the applicant's replies make evident the reasons for allowance, satisfying the "record as a whole" proviso of [37 CFR 1.104(e)]. This is particularly true when applicants fully comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) and (c) and 37 CFR 1.133(b). Thus, where the examiner's actions clearly point out the reasons for rejection and the applicant's reply explicitly presents reasons why claims are patentable over the reference, the reasons for allowance are in all probability evident from the record and no statement should be necessary.

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' Responses are replies that "explicitly present[]" reasons why claims are patentable over the [cited references]." Thus, Applicants submit that the Statement of Reasons for Allowance should be understood only to refer to the arguments made

of record, and should not be understood as requiring or implying that other reasons for allowance have been relied on in allowing the claims. Therefore, all reasons for allowance should be understood from the arguments clearly set forth in the prosecution history, and the Statement of Reasons for Allowance should not be construed as narrowing the claims.

Specifically, Applicants set forth in Applicants' Responses as reasons why claims 1, 4-8, 11-15 and 18-21 are patentable over the cited references that: the cited references fail to disclose or suggest at least "in response to determining the system is receiving power from a battery power source, setting the associativity level to a first level of associativity, the first level of associativity includes greater associativity than a second level of associativity," which has a clear meaning that is distinctly pointed out in the claim limitations. Applicants' Responses set forth that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest at least the aforementioned limitation, and the Office accepted these arguments.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: 8/28/2006

/Dermot G. Miller/
Dermot G. Miller
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 58,309

12400 Wilshire Blvd., 7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
Telephone: (503) 684-6200